

REMARKS

In response to the above-noted Office Action, Applicant submits amended drawings in which the reference signs 4 and 8 which are not mentioned in the description have been deleted.

Claim 1 has been objected to due to there being insufficient antecedent basis for the terms “the left projector” and “the right projector.” In response, although Applicant believes that the terms “the left projector” and “the right projector” have sufficient antecedent basis in that the claim specifies “left” and “right” correction of an image simultaneously projected onto said screen from each of two positions, Applicant has amended claim 1 to provide unambiguous and clear antecedent basis. However, Applicant has changed the references to “left” and “right” to “first” and “second” respectively since the designations of “left” and “right” with respect to the projectors are a possible source of ambiguity.

Claims 1-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vlahos in view of Fellingner. Applicant traverses this rejection and requests reconsideration thereof in view of the following discussion.

As set forth in claim 1, the present invention uses first and second projectors to project left and right generated corrections of an image. The purpose of using the two projectors is to allow for the projection of an image onto a projection screen without a shadow which would normally appear when a presenter is standing between the projector and the projection screen.

In the Action, the Examiner contends that Vlahos discloses a “method for projecting an image onto a projection screen without said image being projected onto a presenter moving about in front of said screen, and without said presenter casting a shadow” referring to column 1, lines 44-53 and Figures 1-9 of Vlahos. While the present application contains language similar to the quoted language, for example in the Abstract, Applicant has been unable to locate any such language in Vlahos, U.S. Patent No. 6,454,415. Moreover, since Vlahos discloses a single projector, it is not seen how this reference could be used so as to eliminate the shadow created by a presenter standing between the projector and the projection screen since light emanating from a

single source cannot bend around a solid object which is what would be necessary to eliminate the shadow cast by an object between a single projector and a projection screen. For this reason, even assuming that the secondary reference Fellingner which is directed to a method and apparatus for tracking a pointing device in a video field, could be used in combination with Vlahos, such combination, with the single projector disclosed by Vlahos, could not possibly operate to provide the full projected image on the screen, without the presenter's shadow as disclosed and claimed by Applicant.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of the claims and early allowance of pending claims 1-17 is requested.

If there are any fees due in connection with the filing of this response, please charge those fees to our Deposit Account No. 02-2666. If a telephone interview would expedite the prosecution of this Application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at (310) 207-3800.


Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR, & ZAFMAN

Dated:

7/16/04


By:



Eric S. Hyman
Reg. No. 30,139

12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, California 90025
(310) 207-3800

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING:

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class Mail, With Sufficient Postage, In An Envelope Addressed To: Mail Stop: Responses/Commissioner For Patents P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
 7/19/04
Linda Marie D'Elia

ESH/lmd